

CONFIDENTIAL

WITHDRAWN
as was Reference (c)

16 April 1946

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: C.P.S. Action on the Proposed Revision of C.I.G. Administrative Order No. 3.

REFERENCES: (a) Memorandum, 1 April 1946, "Revision of the Proposed Organization of the Central Reports Staff."
(b) Memorandum, 3 April 1946, "Revision of C.I.G. Administrative Order No. 3."
(c) C.P.S. Memorandum, 12 April 1946, "Proposed Revision of C.I.G. Administrative Order No. 3."

1. On Monday, 1 April, I submitted Reference (a) to you, having previously laid it before the Council for information and comment. The members of the Council were favorably disposed toward the memorandum, except the representative of the C.P.S., who was non-committal. After discussion, you gave your approval.

2. On Tuesday, 2 April, before the Council's weekly meeting with you, I was given a copy of a C.P.S. memorandum to you recommending that action on Reference (a) be deferred pending a detailed study of the subject by C.P.S. It appeared to me that this memorandum showed both a complete lack of realism in C.P.S. regarding the subject and a disposition on the part of C.P.S. to intrude in the internal administration of supposedly coordinate subdivisions of C.I.G.

3. In order to confirm the decision of 1 April I raised the issue of the C.P.S. memorandum in the Council's meeting with you, and there was lengthy discussion of both my proposals regarding C.R.S. and the relationship of C.P.S. to the coordinate subdivisions of C.I.G. At the conclusion of the meeting I understood your decision to be:

a. That you approved in principle my recommendations regarding C.R.S.

b. That I should draft a revision of C.I.G. Administrative Order No. 3 to accomplish the decision taken.

CONFIDENTIAL

000052

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/31 : CIA-RDP84-00022R000400040003-4

3. That my draft should be referred to C.P.S. for review, not with respect to the merits of your decision, but with respect to whether, as a draftsman, I had expressed it adequately.

4. My draft, Reference (b) was submitted next day, 3 April, and was referred to C.P.S. Despite the well advertised urgency of the matter, it appears that C.P.S. gave it no consideration whatever until 12 April, when I inquired why no action had been taken. The matter was then referred to an officer who had not participated in the previous discussions of the subject and, indeed, had not even been informed of them. (He telephoned me on the evening of 12 April to inquire about it.) Nevertheless, the C.P.S. report, Reference (c), is dated 12 April. My point here is that, despite the delay of nine days, it cannot be pretended that the C.P.S. report is based on any thorough inquiry into the realities of the subject or upon profound study. It is distinctly uninformed and impromptu.

5. Reference (c) exceeds my understanding of the terms of ~~the~~ reference to C.P.S. by arguing against your decision of ten days before. The points raised in paragraph 2 can be answered readily, as follows:

a. This point is not a criticism of the proposed revision, but of the original Order itself, since the terms on which it bears are identical in both texts. Consequently it is an argument for rather than against revision. I would consider the matter implicit, but if it is considered necessary to make it explicit it can readily be included in the proposed revision.

b. The criticism suggests an unorganized mass of 60-odd people, whereas the proposed text expressly provides that they shall be organized, without prescribing a detailed form of organization. Therein the text is certainly consonant with the discussion and decision of 2 April. If the C.P.S. could approve, as it did, the Order adopted today with respect to the Administrative Division, it cannot consistently raise this point with respect to C.R.S.

c. The necessity for the paper was set forth in Reference (a) and in the discussions on 1 and 2 April, of which the author of Reference (c) was unfortunately ignorant.

6. The course of action recommended in Reference (c) not only flies in the face of C.P.S.'s own arguments in para. 2 thereof, but completely misses the point of the proposed revision. It would actually give the Chief, C.P.S., the liberty of action sought, without regard to the points made in 2a and 2b, but would do so by means of unpublicized instructions. Personnel requisitioning for the C.R.S. is considerably more complex than for the C.P.S. It may be on that account that the C.P.S. is unable to appreciate the confusion

Approved For Release 2000/05/31 : CIA-RDP84-00022R000400040003-4

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/31 : CIA-RDP84-00022R000400040003-4

which might reasonably ensue in the Departments on receipt of personnel requisitions on a regional basis without any action rescinding certain parts of C.I.G. Administrative Order No. 3.

7. The constructive advice of the C.P.S. with respect to the organization and operation of the C.R.S. would certainly be welcome. The attitude which it has taken, without any grasp of the realities, has been of more hindrance than help in an already difficult situation. The C.P.S. has sufficient business of its own to occupy its time, without undertaking obstructive interference in the organization and operations of coordinate subdivisions of C.I.G.

8. Recommendations:

a. That the C.P.S. be discharged from further consideration of the proposed revision of C.I.G. Administrative Order No. 3.

b. That the proposed revision be approved, subject to editorial revision by the Secretary, N.I.A.

c. That, as a matter of practice, matters involving the internal administration of coordinate subdivisions of the CIG be not referred to the C.P.S. except when issues of major policy are involved.

LUDWELL L. MONTAGUE
Acting Chief, C.R.S.

Approved For Release 2000/05/31 : CIA-RDP84-00022R000400040003-4

CONFIDENTIAL